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Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ______ .

2a)☐ This action is FINAL.

2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) ______ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) 1-9 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on ______ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ______ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ______.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


a)☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ______.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ______.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: ______.
DETAILED ACTION

Restriction Requirement

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
   I. Claims 1-5, drawn to a polymer composition of a cationic polymer and co-binder polymer, classified in class 525, subclass 217+.
   II. Claims 6-7, drawn to a composite of a fibrous material and a binder, classified in class 442, subclass 61+.
   III. Claim 8, drawn to wet wipes comprising a fibrous material and a binder formulation with complex anions, classified in class 442, subclass 61+.
   IV. Claim 9, drawn to a method of making wet wipes, classified in class 442, subclass 61+.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

3. Inventions of Groups I-III are interrelated as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product of Group I is deemed to be useful as an adhesive between fabric layers, and the inventions of Group II are deemed to be useful as a binder composition in the absence of complex anions, and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

4. Inventions of Group IV and III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed
can be made by another and materially different process such as by incorporating the metal salt into the binder prior to application to the fibrous web.

5. Inventions I and II are related to the inventions of Group IV as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the products as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product such as an adhesive between fabric layers.

6. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and/or have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

**Election of Species Requirement**

7. This application contains claims directed to the following genera of patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

   a. triggerable or ion-specific cationic polymers (Groups I-IV),
   b. non-cross-linked co-binder polymers (Groups I-IV),
   c. fibrous materials (Groups II-IV), and
   d. divalent metal salts (Groups III and IV).

8. As appropriate to the elected group of inventions applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to elect a **single ultimate** disclosed specie for each of the above genera for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Where specific species are not identified in the claims applicant should elect a specific specie from the specification. An alternative method of election is to identify an Example which collectively exemplifies the elected species. Currently, Claims 6, 8 and 9 appear to be generic in their respective groups to the above species.

Examples of single ultimate disclosed species of (a), (b), (c) and (d) are: (a) a (2-(methacryloyloxy)ethyl-
trimethyl ammonium chloride/n-butyl acrylate copolymer, (b) an ethylene/vinyl acetate copolymer, (c)
rayon fibers, and (d) zinc chloride.

9. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species
that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any
claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is
considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

10. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to
additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an
allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant
must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

11. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant
should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious
variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of
the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection
under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Conclusion to Restriction/Election Requirement

12. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of
the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

13. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the
inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named
inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of
inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37
CFR 1.17(i).

14. Applicant is reminded that if claims directed to the product are elected, and a product claim is
subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the
limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined. See M.P.E.P. § 821.04.

Information Disclosure Statements

15. Applicant has submitted 480 references, an exceedingly large number, in the combined
disclosure statements of Papers 4 and 5. As applicant must surely realize, such a large number of
references obscures the importance of any of the individual references. Accordingly, applicant is
requested to identify those references most closely related to the instantly claimed invention to which the
Examiner should direct his primary attention.

res: 8/17/02
Future Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. R. Wilson whose telephone number is 703-308-2398.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on 703-308-2450. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-5408 for regular communications and 703-305-3599 for After Final communications. The unofficial direct fax phone number to the Examiner's desk is 703-872-9029.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 308-2351.

D. R. Wilson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1713